DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 561 FL 005 645

AUTHOR Scollon, Ronald
TITLE A Real Early Stage: An Unzippered Condensation of a Dissertation on Child Language. Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol. 5, No. 6.
INSTITUTION Hawaii Univ., Honolulu. Dept. of Linguistics.
PUB DATE Jun 73
NOTE 16p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Child Language; Context Clues; Distinctive Features; *Language Development; *Language Learning Levels; Language Patterns; Linguistic Competence; *Linguistic Performance; Phonology; Sentence Structure; Syntax

ABSTRACT

Previous studies have defined the earliest stage of child language to be the stage at which an uninitiated speaker of adult language can understand sentences spoken by the child. Upon the examination of the language of one child, aged 1 year and 7 months, it became evident that she could talk, even though it was equally evident that she didn't use sentences. Her usage was explained on the basis of "vertical constructions" as opposed to "horizontal constructions" or sentences. Four types of vertical constructions were analyzed in this child's speech: Type A, which is the last to develop, consisting of two or three utterances in close succession; type B, which is like type A, except that the words may be repeated; type C, which is also like type A but involves the intervention of another speaker; and type D, which is like C with repetition of some words. Within the structure of the vertical constructions, one discovers two-word horizontal components, suggesting the possibility that vertical construction is at the heart of the structure of discourse. The data on vertical constructions have been ignored by most investigators since successful sentence usage was not involved, but by expanding one's analysis to include one-word utterances, repetitions, and "unintelligible" utterances, it can be seen that the child is learning to speak meaningfully at a much earlier age than was previously thought. (LG)

ED 094561

WORKING PAPERS
IN
LINGUISTICS

The notes and articles contained in these Working Papers constitute progress reports on work being carried on in the Department. While they are not intended for public distribution because of their tentative and preliminary status, they are being privately circulated to interested scholars on a limited basis for the purpose of inviting comments and suggestions on the ideas set forth in them. Because these papers are not finished products embodying the final views of their authors, readers are advised that they should not be cited without some allusion to their preliminary nature. They are not to be reproduced without their authors' consent.

We regret that we are unable to place the names of individuals or libraries on the regular mailing list for our Working Papers. Budgetary considerations force us to restrict the list to selected sister departments. However, authors of individual papers are provided with copies of their articles and can supply these to individuals upon request.

Volume 5, Number 6
June 1973

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ronald Scollon
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
HONOLULU 96822

FL005645

A REAL EARLY STAGE: AN UNZIPPERED CONDENSATION OF A DISSERTATION ON CHILD LANGUAGE

Ronald Scollon
University of Hawaii

ED 094561

In Honolulu, on September 12, 1972, a little girl who was one year, seven months and two days old picked up her mother's shoe, held it right before her eyes and while she stared at it said, [mama|mama|mama|mam|š|šɪ|š|šɪš|šu|šu'|šuš]. It was no accident that I was there with a tape recorder since at the time I thought that I was studying this little girl's phonology. It was also no accident that I was very surprised at what she had said since this was my first experience at recording a real child and, to judge from the reports I was familiar with, children at this age did not say such things.

We all know that no well settled ideas are unseated by a single example. I continued to worry about this child's phonology--particularly stress and intonation--and to forget about incidents like 'mama. shoe' until I noticed we had started to have little conversations. For example, one day four weeks later this little child, whose name is Brenda, said to me, [k^ha|k^ha|k^ha|k^ha]. I didn't understand and said "What?" She then said, [gɔo|go]. The next thing I said cannot be heard clearly enough on the tape to transcribe, but Brenda then said, [bəiš], nine times. I still didn't understand what she was saying and said "What? Oh, bicycle? Is that what you said?" Her answer was, [na']. I said, "No?" She, [na']. I, "No--I got it wrong."

In the transcription it looked like this:

(1) k^ha
k^ha
k^ha
k^ha

What?

gɔo
go

x x x.

bəiš
bəiš
bəiš
bəiš
bəiš
bəiš
bəiš
bəiš
bəiš

FL005 695

What? Oh, bicycle? Is that what you said?

na'

No?

na'

No--I got it wrong.

If this is a conversation it is certainly a very negative one. But there is more to be said. What I have quoted is what I heard and thought at the time of the tape recording. However, the first stage of enlightenment came in making the transcription. Starting just before Brenda says [k^ha] a car can be heard passing in the street outside.[1] I had not noticed the car and as a result had no context for Brenda's 'car'. Knowing 'car', the next word can be understood clearly as 'go'. Unfortunately, since I had missed the first I also missed the second. Brenda's move then was to try again with another word.

The second stage of enlightenment began during the next week when Brenda's mother was describing a trip to the doctor. She was saying that a woman came in wearing a skirt with the same pattern as Brenda's sister's blanket. The mother then quotes Brenda as saying, "lady. blanket. blanket." Then Brenda said, [brɛndə|šip^{h}i'|baš|baš]. Of course, on the first hearing I missed the relevance of this altogether. The connection couldn't be made until I understood what Brenda had said. I asked the mother how they had gone to the doctor and what Brenda had done on the way. The mother said that they went on the bus and that Brenda always sleeps on the bus. Apart from giving another nice example of a little story the child had told me, the two instances of [baš] made it fairly clear that the nine words I could not understand the week earlier were, in fact, 'bus'. When I could not understand her attempts at 'car. go' she tried again with another word, 'bus', presumably in place of 'car'. And as a final detail of clarification it should be mentioned that although I am fairly sure it was a car passing in the street it might have been a bus since they also pass within hearing distance.

If the transcription is <u>translated</u> on the basis of this information we get the following conversation:

(2) car. (4 times)

What?

go. (2 times)

x x x.

bus. (9 times)

What? Oh, bicycle? Is that what you said?

not.[2]

No?

not.

No--I got it wrong.

Looked at in this way I come on a little like the old deaf auntie who can't understand anything anyone says. And I'm not the only one. Look at the mother.

(3) (Brenda is looking straight into an electric fan with her hair blowing back)

fẽĩ
fæ̃

(Mother) Hm?

fæ̃

Bathroom?

fanĩ
faĩ

Fan! Yeah.

k^hu

Cool, yeah. Fan makes you cool.

This example hardly needs a translation. It is clear that Brenda's phonology isn't up to 'fan' but the mother and child are willing to keep going until some understanding is reached about the first word. Then, and this is the remarkable thing, Brenda has something more to add to it.

By the time I had worked through a number of these little conversations and 'stories' I had become unsettled enough to start scanning the literature to find out if this kind of thing had been reported. What I found could be roughly paraphrased (some will think far too roughly) as "if a child doesn't use sentences she doesn't talk."[3] In my dealings with Brenda I had become quite certain that she could talk. I was also sure that she did not use sentences. This was the source of dissonance that ultimately distracted me from my interest in Brenda's phonology. The resolution, for me, came with the development of some new meanings for an old word--'construction'.

In trying to reconcile the raw data I had gathered with the knowledge I had acquired in linguistics as well as the knowlege that was found in the 'standard' sources on child language I came up with a group of approximate synonyms. I found that 'construction' is 'sentence' is 'syntax' is 'grammar' is 'linguistic theory' is 'the proper business of all of us in linguistics'. In general, I had to decide that 'construction' is not necessarily 'sentence' and let the rest of the synonyms fall where they may.

At the time of the examples which I have quoted Brenda did not say any sentences. Several months later she did. I used stress, intonation contour, and the absence of a pause between the elements to decide that they were sentences. In other words, I used my adult intuitions.[4] I also transcribed them on one line. It was this accident of the layout of transcriptions that supplied both terminology and conceptual foundation for my thinking about constructions. I call sentences 'horizontal constructions' and I call the other ones, for which the tradition had not given me a name, 'vertical constructions'. In the first case, then, I have avoided using such terms as 'sentence', 'pivot-open', 'telegraphic' and 'two-word'. In the second case I have invented a term that would express the constructional nature while keeping them separate from horizontal construction.

The constructional nature of horizontal constructions has been well established although the structural meaning is far from settled. I am going to assume that the reader accepts that horizontal constructions are genuine constructions and talk mostly about vertical constructions. To call something a construction we need some evidence that it didn't happen that way by accident. To link two or more utterances that are not linked by an intonation pattern other evidence has to be considered.

I can describe four types of vertical construction, which I will call types A, B, C and D, in the order of the strength of this intentional linkage, type A being the most obvious construction and type D being the weakest case. Type A, which is the last to develop, is much like horizontal construction. It consists of two one-word utterances in close succession with silence before and after which are linked in all but intonational contour. By 'linked' I mean that in these cases there is a definite semantic connection that is appropriate to the context. Several examples will clarify what I mean.

(4) (Brenda reaches out to carefully touch the microphone with the tip of her finger)

finger.[5]
touch.

(5) (Brenda lifts her foot and holds it over the tape recorder pretending to step on it.)

tape.
step.

(6) (Brenda is 'reading' to me from a picture-story book.)

cook.
say.

What'd the cook say?

something.

In (5) the word order is the opposite of that expected on the basis of the ordering of horizontal constructions. Otherwise one gets that of adult English. It is apparently the case that in vertical construction word order is considerably more flexible than in horizontal construction. Since these constructions are so much like horizontal constructions I think it is likely that they have been grouped together with them in some of the reported studies as 'two-word' constructions. That would account for some of the earlier despair found, particularly in diary studies, over the lack of regular word ordering.

The second type of vertical construction, type B, which appears much earlier than type A, is like type A in that two words occur in sequence that show an appropriate semantic connection. These two types differ only in that one or the other or both words may be repeated in type B. The example with which I began of 'mama... shoe' is of this type. It is clear from the context that Brenda is making the statement "this is Mama's shoe". This is evidenced by the fact that after getting 'mama' out she moves directly on to the second word. It is also important to notice the difficulty with which she does this. In making the transition from the first word to the second 'mama' becomes [mam] and then Brenda takes a number of tries to get 'shoe' pronounced.

Here is a second example in which this difficult transition from the first word to the second shows up.

(7) (Brenda and her sister--4 1/2 years old--are drawing pictures. The sister draws a girl with long legs and a dress with large polka dots.)

$t^h_h ɔ$ 6
$t^h_h ə$
$t^h_h æ'$
$k^h_h æ'$
$k^h_h ə̃ã ũ$
$k^h ãæ ũ$

The first word and the last word appear during the same tape independently and can be identified as 'tall' and 'clown', respectively. When used independently there is no phonetic variation. The difficulty only arises when Brenda tries to construct 'tall clown'.

In these two types of construction it is clear that Brenda is trying to say something beyond the limits of a single word utterance. It should be pointed out now that these two types are on a developmental continuum. What I mean is that the examples of type A are almost all found in the last session of eight weeks of consecutive weekly taping.

Type B constructions are found in the earlier sessions. If I gave more examples I could demonstrate that the development of this type of construction can be measured in terms of difficulty. First the difficulty shows up in the great number of repetitions and in the phonetic instability of the words used in construction. As Brenda's phonology and construction ability improve there are fewer repetitions and greater stability in phonetic shape. Ultimately type B becomes type A when no repetition of the separate elements is necessary and then the only indication of difficulty is that the phonetic shape suffers.

Existing in parallel with these two types of construction are two others which are not radically different. Type C constructions are like type A in that two words are linked semantically and without repetition. However, in these constructions the speech of another speaker intervenes. (6) above is of this type. Brenda says, "something" in response to my asking, "What'd the cook say?" Whether or not her 'something' should be understood to be in direct linkage with her earlier two words is difficult to say. It is certainly appropriate to my question. But, in turn, my question had the effect of asking for a constituent to fill out Brenda's construction.

Two more examples will demonstrate this type of prompting.

(7) Kimby. (Kimby is a cousin who was not present--nor were any of her toys or other things. That is, there was no obvious meaning of this utterance that could be inferred from the context.)
(Mother) What about Kimby?
close. (i.e. 'closed')

(8) hiding.
(Ron) Hiding? What's hiding?
balloon.

In the first case the mother could not make sense from Brenda's utterance[7] and simply asked her "What about Kimby?" The second case is similar. In both cases what can be seen is that the other speakers have taken Brenda's first utterance as the statement of a topic and have asked her to clarify it or comment on it. From the point of view of topic-comment construction the apparent lack of word order in vertical construction is not so disquieting. (5) above, 'tape. step.', could well be described as a topic-comment construction. Rather than belabor the topic-comment point I want to suggest that this interaction with other speakers may well be the means by which Brenda has learned how to construct in the first place.

As more evidence that interaction with other speakers is crucial to the development of vertical construction we can look at the fourth, and by far most common type, type D. These constructions amount to a combination of types B and C. That is, any of the words may be repeated and there is the intervention of other speakers. The tapes are literally full of interactions of this type. Some of them have rather shaky status as constructions in that the words appear to be simply the listing of separate elements of an object, or a situation, or perhaps, a listing of a group of attributes. However, in many of these constructions, such as (1) and (3) it is evident that Brenda intended to go on to the second word but was simply waiting for verification from the listener that he had understood. In the 'car. go' case this verification was not achieved and the communication died in misunderstanding. In the 'fan. cool' case understanding was reached and, I might add in passing, rewarded with an enthusiastic "Cool, yeah. Fan makes you cool."

In the case of types A and B, I described them as being on a continuum, with type A as the final development. The same can be said of types C and D but with some qualification. As Brenda's phonology improves and as the adults' understanding improves the number of repetitions needed to get a response decreases. Again, most of the examples of type C are in the later sessions with type D more frequent in the earlier sessions. The qualification that must be added is that there is really no clear distinction between vertical constructions in which another speaker intervenes and those in which there is no intervention. In many cases the intervention is simply an accidental simultaneity and no relation can be established. In many cases there is a clear relation between what the other speaker says after Brenda's topic and what Brenda says in comment. But in some of these cases, at least, it is not clear that she would not have said the same thing anyway. Finally, in other cases it is clear that Brenda is only waiting for some indication that her first utterance was within some tolerance limits of understanding and she gets on with the construction.

Perhaps a diagram of these four types of vertical construction will be helpful. The four types can be cross classified on the dimensions of repetition and intervening discourse. Type A, then, could be marked as [-repetition][-discourse], type B marked as [+repetition][-discourse], type C marked as [-repetition][+discourse], and type D marked as [+repetition][+discourse]. The following diagram indicates this cross classification.

(9)	[-discourse]	[+discourse]
[-repetition]	A	C
[+repetition]	B	D

It should be remembered that the elimination of repetition in the production of vertical constructions is a later development. The freedom from dependency on intervening discourse is also a later development. These two facts operate to make the other types of construction eventually converge on type A as the culmination of a developmental trend.

Now I can review the general development of vertical construction in the putative one-word period. It begins with somewhat tentative constructions in discourse that are cluttered with misunderstandings, repetitions, phonological distortions and other indicators of difficulty. With development, all of these problems are reduced. Others understand Brenda more easily at the same time as her phonological control is becoming more secure. This has the effect of requiring fewer repetitions to achieve the same end. Finally, Brenda arrives at the point where she can put two words together in sequence with only a distortion of phonetic shape and, perhaps, word order difficulty--although word order is generally consistent with later horizontal construction. She has arrived at the threshold of horizontal construction, not by miracle nor accident but by a fairly long (I have described only eight weeks from the middle of this period here) process of active practice in construction.

If this was the end of the story I would be happy with having illuminated, at least for my own benefit, the dark ages of the putative holophrastic child. What is spectacular, though, is that these processes of vertical construction do not lead into horizontal construction as into a dead end. When horizontal construction relieves vertical construction of the burden of two-word construction the constructional possibilities are simply multiplied.

First, let's look at some samples of horizontal construction taken from two months after the last of the eight sessions just described. Brenda was one year, ten months, and seventeen days old. The mean length of utterance for this taping session was 1.46 which puts her dead center in what has variously been called 'Stage I', 'the two-word period' and so on. The following is an exhaustive list of all the horizontal constructions in one hour of tape and should convince the informed reader that Brenda's horizontal constructions agree with those published from other children of the same period in both variety and structure. Particularly, I want to note in passing[8] that with very few exceptions word order is indicative of semantic-sentential relations. For example, all of the examples in (10) Group 1 can be described as Noun-Verb constructions and in every case the Noun is in the relation of Subject to the Verb and the Noun is also in the relation of agent to the action.

(10)

Group 1

Ron talk.
Brenda talk.
corder talk.
cat sleeping.
Brenda read now.
monster go.
monster eat.
more coming out.
peach boy coming out.

Group 2

see that.
eat this.
read dat.
like that.
like that song.
see Ron.
drink soup.
wash clothing.
wash clothes.
hiding Halet.[9]
hiding Brenda.
lock it.
read it.
now read it.
do it.
use it.
pick it.
wind it.
hold it.
find it.
found it.
have it.
stick it.
scrub it.
clean it.
dry it.
drain it.
write it.
bring it.

Group 3

picture mark.
key lock.

Group 4

bring home.
bring it home.
take home.
taked it home.
fill up.
fill it up.
fill up it.
cut it down.
tree down.
horn off.
leave it on.
put it on.
get out.
get up.
turning around.
gassing up.

Group 5

who dere.
Brenda here.
water on it.

Group 6

in there.
on dere.

Group 7

icy juicy.
scary monster.
my turn.
banana leaf.
tape corder.
tape cording.
horsie-ride.
paper napkin.
Aunty Hoppie.

Group 8

dat one cat.
dis cat.
this way.
this is way.

Group 9

dog some.
doggie some.

Group 10

thank you.
don't, Halet.

The way this list has been presented shows horizontal constructions much as they have appeared in the published data on this period. What startled me was to place these horizontal constructions back into the context of the tape from which they were taken and look at the vertical constructions in which they function. Look at these:

(11)

1. Brenda.
   see that.

2. Ron.
   make.
   tape corder.

3. my turn.
   do it.

4. this way.
   hold it. (3x)
   holding. (2x)

5. tape corder.
   in there.

6. tape corder.
   use it. (2x)
   (R) Use it for what?
   talk.
   corder talk.
   Brenda talk.

7. bathtub.
   scrub it. (2x)
   paper napkin.

8. rabbit.
   put it on.

9. writing. (2x)
   read dat.

10. cut it down. (2x)
    strong.
    read dat. (2x)

11. scary monster.
    read dat.

12. rotten.
    food.
    dog some.

13. Ron.
    (R) O.K.
    Ron talk.

14. soup. (4x)
    (R) What are you talking about?
    drink soup.

For some time investigators have lamented the fact that we have only performance data to look at. It has been said that what we need is some kind of evidence for the more complex structures that we feel the child must understand at this time, that the horizontal constructions imply knowledge of more elaborate constructional ability. For this child, Brenda, there is a great deal of evidence. Look at (11) 1 and 2. The vertical construction in both cases produces Subject - Verb - Object adult English word order. Horizontal

constructions imply that it is known. In vertical constructions it actually shows up in speech. Or how about 'my turn. do it.' In this example we have an embedded sentence. (11) is not an exhaustive list of the vertical constructions found in one hour of tape. In general, I can say that most of the horizontal constructions occur in vertical constructions and many of the vertical constructions are striking in the complexity of constructional ability they display.

Perhaps it has been noticed that there are several varieties of vertical constructions in this list. In fact, just the same varieties are present here as in the earlier period. (11) 1, 2, and 3 correspond to type A in which the elements in construction are not repeated and closely follow each other without the intervention of another speaker. Notice that now a vertical construction may have three elements and that any of those elements may be a horizontal construction. And the final point about this type is that, as earlier, this type of construction is the rarest. This is interesting in that (11) 1, 2, and 3 show the highest degree of complexity in terms of adult syntax. In the same way that 'finger. touch.' represented the highest point in the development of one-word vertical construction, 'Ron. make. tape-corder.' or 'my turn. do it.' may represent the highest point in the development of two-word horizontal component vertical construction.[10]

The second type of vertical construction, type B, allows repetition of any of the elements. For example, in the first part of (11) 6 'use it' is repeated. (11) 7 is also of this type. Again, there is a feeling of difficulty in performance that is surmounted by the technique of repetition.

Types C and D have another speaker intervening in discourse with Brenda. Notice in (11) 6 that the speaker (I was the speaker) asked Brenda a question that prompted her response.

I think it is important to mention again that these examples were all taken from a single hour of tape. In this case we are not looking at a development history. All of these types are present during the same hour and I have no general indication of development for this period. By now, however, the continuity with the earlier period should be clear. It should be clear that vertical construction is a phenomenon that develops during the pre-horizontal construction period but that it remains active at least well into this period.

One further point of continuity can be noticed in (11) 6 through 14. The construction seems to be quite clearly topic-comment. Look at (11) 9, for instance, 'writing. writing. read dat.' I was reading a story to Brenda that included a section where the boy in the story

was learning to write. The meaning of Brenda's construction was 'read the part about writing' which was evidenced by her leafing through the pages until she found that picture. These topic-comment constructions are, by far, the most plentiful of the vertical constructions in this sample. In retrospect, this type of construction can be seen to have developed in the interaction Brenda has had with other speakers. It is very tempting to think that vertical construction, which is first learned in discourse, ultimately remains at the heart of the structure of discourse. I have tried to show that for this earliest period of horizontal construction there was a preceding period of vertical construction as preparation. Further, during the first period of horizontal construction vertical construction remained active in producing the proto-types of longer horizontal constructions of later periods. This suggests that, in fact, discourse structure is at the heart of sentence structure from the beginning of its development.

The question that remains to be discussed is why don't other investigators have anything like this in their data? One answer is that some investigators do. In a number of pre-generative studies the so-called one-word period was recorded in some detail. That automatically included some vertical constructions. In later studies there has also been occasional mention of what I take to be vertical construction. However, it is always treated as being quite puzzling as well it might be to investigators who have been determined to look at nothing beyond the sentence.

This, of course, is the crux of the matter. In the reports that I have studied three types of data that I have found essential for my argument have been systematically (and sometimes unsystematically) excluded. I refer to 'one-word' utterances, repetitions, and unintelligible utterances. In the first case it is obvious that any study that has had the intent of studying only sentences would include no single words since they would be considered irrelevant. This exclusion has been quite systematic when investigators have recorded only sentences such as in some diary studies. It is also systematic when investigators have begun with children who were already into the horizontal construction stage.

The exclusion of repetitions has been both systematic and an accident of the method. Some investigators have simply declared repetitions irrelevant. Others, particularly earlier diary studies, have eliminated repetitions because of the difficulty of recording them. In an on-the-scene transcription very little of the total speech can be recorded even by a very good linguist. The proof of this is the length of time it takes the same linguist to transcribe a tape of the same setting. Something has to go and repetitions have been considered to be among the less interesting things happening.

The elimination of unintelligible utterances may seem the best justified of the three types of data I mentioned. It is certainly true that they have been elimimated. The standard for transcription is generally to transcribe whatever is immediately and unquestionably intelligible. In some cases the transcription was left up to people who were not experts, which guaranteed the exclusion of everything but the most unimpeachably intelligible data.

The point I am making is that all of these three types of data have been crucial to my argument. In the first place most of the data came from the 'one-word' period--a period that has largely been ignored except by studies of phonology. In the second place I have used repetitions as an important indicator of development as well as an indicator of complexity in production. In the third place I have found that with experience of the child's world and developing phonological system I was able to 'stretch' my understanding so that utterances which were at first hearing unintelligible became quite defensibly intelligible. It was on the basis of a number of these utterances that constructions were first noticed. It is also true that because of the complexity introduced by vertical construction the phonetic shape of some of the words was affected. Some of these, such as the intermediate steps between 'tall' and 'clown' in (7) above were simply unintelligible as one or the other. They did have considerable importance, however, in pointing up the constructional nature of the whole.

I have found that studies of child language during the past decade have operated with a working definition of the earliest stage of language. The earliest stage has been taken to be when an uninitiated speaker of the adult language can clearly understand sentences spoken by the child without reference to the context. My study has shown that to the extent that the adult speaker's understanding can be enhanced by interaction with the child and by close attention to the detail in tape recordings, the definition of the earliest language can be pushed back to an age earlier than that taken by the first definition. This 'stretching' has not occurred in other studies because of methodological decision about what is relevant data; that decision in turn has been based on an assumption about what earliest language is.

The important question is: what difference does this redefinition make either in the description of a child's language or in the theoretical conclusions drawn from the description? The obvious difference is that the child is seen as beginning much earlier to speak meaningfully with people--eight months to a year old instead of eighteen to twenty-four months. The second important difference in description is that the child is seen to develop the ability to construct over a period of six months to a year rather than suddenly making constructions without developmental preparation.

Perhaps the most important theoretical consideration is methodological. In the case of the first definition of the earliest stage of a child's language the definition was a result of the method of, first, diary studies and, then, the assumption that sentences were the proper units of data for analysis. In studies of this type the data were always selected through a filter of immediate intelligibility and non-repetition. I arrived at a second definition of the earliest stage of language by an accident of the method I was using for a study of phonology and intonation. I had enlarged the boundaries of my study to include much that couldn't be understood on one hearing or perhaps without knowing the developmental history and to include such things as repetitions that are annoying to transcribe or, for that matter, to listen to. However, this second definition of language uncovered processes that the child uses to learn and improve her ability to speak, i.e., repetition and vertical construction.

In both cases the definition of language was not specified as part of the research design but was, rather, implicit in it. Neither case leads to a final definition of language nor even a method to arrive at one. However, each definition can be seen to be compatible with a particular theoretical approach. In the first case, the framework is that of generative grammar which holds to the primacy of the sentence. This study, by contrast, calls for a framework in which the study of isolated sentences is meaningless. This framework depends crucially on explicit establishment of context as a prerequisite for grammatical analysis.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Perhaps, for readers who have never lived in the tropics, it should be mentioned that with jalousies rather than windows a car passing in the street often sounds as if it is passing in the next room. Some of us have tried to learn not to notice.

[2]Hawaiian English often has 'not' as a one word negative indicating a denial of some assertion.

[3]I refer the scrupulous reader to my longer study "One Child's Language: the Origins of Construction" (MS) for citations from the literature in support of this and other such blatant assertions.

[4]Again, I refer the reader to my longer study in which the development of stress and intonation contour is discussed for the year preceding the first sentences.

[5]I have switched to an orthographic translation of the original transcription to make the construction more easily understood. In fact, in these constructions there was a marked deterioration of the phonetic quality as compared to productions of single words which is further evidence of the constructional nature of these utterances.

[6]In Hawaiian English, Brenda's form [t^hɔ] is an acceptable form (as is 'car' [k^ha] mentioned earlier). Since forms of this sort are common in child phonology at this stage there is no means of deciding to what extent these forms are affected by child phonological processes.

[7]Nor have I been able to make sense of it except that the mother reports that Brenda always blames things on her cousin Kimby. The point is the mother's response.

[8]These internal structures are discussed in full in the longer study from which this is condensed.

[9]'Halet' is Brenda's form for 'Charlotte'.

[10]I am aware of the clumsiness of this terminology but it seems necessary to avoid confusion with earlier terminology which may be misleading in this discussion.